

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	1.	On	January	3,	2022,	defendants	Vaskov	and	Gilmore	(collectively	the	"City
Attor	ney Def	enda	nts") mo	ved	l to dis	smiss plaint	iff LaTes	sha V	Watson's	intentional-in	fliction	on-of
emoti	onal-dis	tress	claim ag	ains	st them	under Neva	da's anti-	-SLA	PP statute	, NRS § 41.60	50. <sup>1</sup>	

- 2. During discovery, the Parties discussed Watson dismissing her claims against Derrick, Ellington, Vaskov, and Gilmore (collectively, the "Individual City Defendants").
- 3. On December 21, 2022, Watson filed a voluntary dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41 of all her claims against the Individual City Defendants.
- 4. Based on Watson's voluntary dismissal of the Individual City Defendants from this case, Vaskov and Gilmore withdraw their special motion to dismiss, and related request for attorneys' fees, as moot.
- 5. The Parties agree that Watson's notice and dismissal of the Individual City Defendants, as well as the City Attorney Defendants' withdrawal of their anti-SLAPP motion to dismiss shall not affect Watson's motion for reconsideration, Kevin Abernathy, Kenneth Kerby, and Richard McCann's motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6),<sup>3</sup> or the City's motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), except for the arguments that apply only to the Individual City Defendants as follows:<sup>4</sup>
  - Section IV(A): That Watson's official-capacity claims against the individuals are redundant;
  - Section IV(B)(2): That the Individual City Defendants are entitled to qualifiedimmunity protection.
- 6. The Parties agree that Watson's voluntary dismissal and this withdrawal shall not impact or affect any other arguments set forth in the City Defendants' motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> ECF No. 104 (special motion to dismiss).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ECF No. 92 (motion for reconsideration).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> ECF No. 109 (Union Defendants' motion to dismiss).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> ECF No. 110 (City Defendants' motion to dismiss).